Application No. 10/015,587
Amdt. dated April 26, 2004
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2004
Docket No. 0504-1048

REMARKS

Responsive to the restriction requirement set forth in the Official Action of March 24, 2004, applicants hereby elect Group II, claims 13-30, drawn to a method of hot-forming a thermoplastic lens, with traverse.

The requirement is believed to be improper, and should not be repeated for the following reasons:

The Official Action notes that the inventions identified in connection with Groups I and II are directed to a process and apparatus for its practice. A process and apparatus for its practice can be shown to be distinct inventions, based on one-way distinctness. The position set forth in the Official Action is that a showing of one-way distinctness is met because the apparatus as claimed can be used to manufacture non-optical articles such as safety rupture disks for small vessels.

However, such an assertion is not tenable. Specifically, applicants' understanding of safety rupture disks for small vessels is that such disks tear if there is an excess of pressure or vacuum so as to limit the pressure of the fluid within the vessel to predetermined values.

In contrast, one of ordinary skill in the lens-making art knows that a thermoplastic material for optical lenses is well known for being resistant to rupture. A safety rupture disk by definition is one that is readily torn and thus must have a

Application No. 10/015,587 Amdt. dated April 26, 2004 Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2004 Docket No. 0504-1048

thickness that is relatively small with respect to a thickness of a hot-formed optical lens.

In the mold according to claim 1 of the present invention, which is intended for making optical lenses, the recited heat transfer means that is adapted to a thermoplastic material lens would not be suitable for forming a safety rupture disk. Specifically, the heat transfer means adapted to a thermoplastic material lens as recited in claim 1 of the present invention would be too large for the manufacture of a safety rupture disk. Accordingly, the apparatus of the present invention could not be used to manufacture safety rupture disks for small vessels.

In light of the above discussion, it is believed the restriction requirement is improper and must be withdrawn. An action on the merits of all claims now in the application is therefore respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

Application No. 10/015,587 Amdt. dated April 26, 2004 Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2004 Docket No. 0504-1048

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231

Attorney for Applicants 745 South 23rd Street Arlington, VA 22202 Telephone (703) 521-2297 Telefax (703) 685-0573

LM/mjr

April 26, 2004